



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/710,748	07/30/2004	Christopher D. Giles	60655.3200	4747
20322	7590	07/07/2006	EXAMINER	
SNELL & WILMER ONE ARIZONA CENTER 400 EAST VAN BUREN PHOENIX, AZ 85004-2202			NGUYEN, CHAU T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/710,748	GILES, CHRISTOPHER D.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Chau Nguyen	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                         |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                                                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                                            | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>08/03/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-6 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Champagne et al., US Patent Application Publication No. US 2005/0086199.

4. As to independent claim 1, Champagne et al. disclose a method for managing electronic forms, said method including:

transmitting at least one host form having form fields from a host to a remote device having a remote database (page 1, paragraph [0009]; transmitting data stored in a plurality of fields of a records of a first database (a host) to a second database (remote device));

entering form data into said form fields to create at least one remote form (page 3, paragraphs [0035]-[0036]: field of categories includes name, last name, first name, middle initial, address, etc. to create a record structure);

communicating with said host to transmit said at least one remote form to said host (page 3, paragraph [0032]: the remote computer sends the host computer the record structure data packet);

mapping said form fields to database record fields within a database of said host; and (page 3, paragraph [0032], and page 4, paragraphs [0043]-[0047]: mapping the records of remote database to the records of host database),

synchronizing said host database with said remote database (page 5, paragraph [0060]: synchronizes the records of host database with the received records of the remote database).

5. As to dependent claim 2, Champagne et al. disclose synchronizing at least one host form with at least one remote form (page 3, paragraph [0034]).

6. As to dependent claim 3, Champagne et al. disclose synchronizing at least one host application with at least one remote application (page 5, paragraph [0060]).

7. As to dependent claim 4, Champagne et al. disclose wherein mapping including predetermined mapping rules (page 2, paragraph [0017]).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Champagne et al. as applied to claims 1-4 above, and further in view of Boothby et al., US Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0049764.

10. As to dependent claim 5, Champagne et al., however, do not explicitly disclose wherein synchronizing includes calculating hash value to determine if a data change exists. Boothby et al. disclose the information sent to the second computer (remote computer) can include information identifying the deleted records or added records (data change), and the information can also include a code based, which may be a hash number (page 1, paragraph [0013] and page 3, paragraph [0036]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Boothby et al. and Champagne et al. to include calculating hash value to determine if a data change exists. Boothby et al. suggest that use hash numbers as a unique identification code and thus it enables the remote and host to identify the unchanged record by its hash code.

11. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Champagne et al. as applied to claims 1-4 above, and further in view of Chen et al., US Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0049751.

12. As to dependent claim 6, Champagne et al., however, do not explicitly disclose verifying credentials of a user of said remote device. Chen et al. disclose client application can be configured for the user to access server application via network 14, but the server requires user to enter certain personal information such as sign-in name and password (credentials of a user) (page 3, paragraphs [0041]-[0043]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chen et al. and Champagne et al. to include verifying credentials of a user of said remote device in order to prevent unauthorized users accessing the remote device.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4092. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. On July 15, 2005, the Central Facsimile (FAX) Number will change from 703-872-9306 to 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chau Nguyen  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2176

*William L. Bashore*  
**WILLIAM BASHORE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**